



Learning to Lead: Women and Success in Corporate America

Allison Elias

This paper uses prescriptive literature to demonstrate the tension between, and ultimately incompatibility of, different notions of gender equity in the 1970s workplace. In most firms, even after the incorporation of equal employment opportunity (EEO) policies, female-dominated clerical and male-dominated management jobs ladders remained distinct such that few clerical workers could perform their way into a management position. Career advice books and magazines emphasized that clerical work was not the path to management despite a slew of changes in corporate policy and culture that promoted equality between the sexes and respectful treatment of all workers. This avoidance of clerical work by the best and brightest further reinforced its ghettoization. While those who could get ahead moved out of women's work and into men's work, those who remained in clerical jobs seemed to be making a choice to be left behind. Feminism as the success of individual women in the free market overcame feminism as a challenge to gender-based inequities that plagued capitalism.

In the 1960s and 1970s, a new type of feminism was transforming interpersonal relationships, family arrangements, and institutional structures.¹ My larger book project

¹ Literature on second-wave feminism includes: Ruth Rosen, *The World Split Open: How The Modern Women's Movement Changed America* (New York: Penguin Books, 2000); Sara Evans, *Tidal Waves: How Women Changed America at Century's End* (New York: Free Press, 2003); Donald G. Mathews and Jane Sherron DeHart, *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and a Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Flora Davis, *Moving the Mountain: The Women's Movement in America Since 1960* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991); Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989); Susan Brownmiller, *In Our Time: Memoir of a Revolution* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1999); Sara Evans, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* (New York: Random House, 1979); Jo Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and Its Relation to the Policy Process* (Philadelphia: David McKay, 1975). For women and work in the 1960s see

Allison Elias <ale52@cornell.edu> is a visiting professor at the Cornell University ILR School.

explores the contested meaning of feminism for women working in U.S. corporations from the 1960s to the 1990s. By the 1960s, two visions of advancing women's status in the modern corporation were emerging. One sought to give individual women greater personal fulfillment by granting them the opportunity to compete for power, money, and status alongside men. The other aimed to use collective action to increase the social and economic value of traditionally-female work. This paper is a slice of that project, showing how the worldview that supported women's ambitions to become corporate leaders undermined the movement to improve women's status as laborers. Feminism as the success of individual women in the free market overcame feminism as a challenge to gender-based inequities that plagued capitalism.

One uncontested success of the feminist movement – women entering work that previously had been restricted to men – actually had detrimental effects on traditionally female jobs. Women could decide what career to pursue now that a wider array of opportunities were available. But these female professionals were pioneers. Without an older generation of female mentors to offer insight on how to succeed in the workplace, a range of management and social science experts arose to provide advice. They directly and crudely told women to avoid clerical work and even to omit such job experience from their resumes if applying for managerial work.

This attitude towards clerical work was not meant to be intentionally hostile but rather it was an attempt to offer quite practical instruction. The reasoning went like this. Because of the stubbornness of the family wage ideal, the overwhelmingly, female-dominated position of clerical worker for decades had scant internal mobility. In most firms, even after the incorporation of equal employment opportunity policies, clerical and management jobs ladders remained distinct such that no clerical worker could perform her way into a management position. As a new generation of educated, professional women in the 1980s sought to climb the corporate ladder, they realized that clerical work was not the path to the top despite a slew of changes in corporate policy and culture that promoted equality between the sexes and respectful treatment of all workers. This avoidance of clerical work by the best and brightest further reinforced its ghettoization. While those who could get ahead moved out of women's work and into men's work, those who remained in clerical jobs seemed to be making a choice to be left behind. "The women's movement has made women embarrassed to be secretaries," a Katharine Gibbs graduate told sociologist Rosabeth Moss Kanter.²

This tension between the gendered nature of secretarial work and the goals of mainstream feminists was reaffirmed in prescriptive literature aimed at ambitious women who wanted to climb corporate ladders. Bestselling books taught women how to behave in order to get ahead, and many spoke frankly and directly about the dead-end nature of clerical work. In *Games Mother Never Taught You* (1978), Betty Harragan, a

Dorothy Sue Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004); Alice Kessler-Harris, *In Pursuit of Equity: Women, Men, and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Nancy MacLean, *Freedom is not Enough: The Opening of the American Workplace* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2006).

² Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Where You Stand in the Power Play," *Working Woman* 2, no. 10, October 1977, 29. Finette McCotter had worked as a secretary for 10 years, and claimed she wanted to be called a secretary not an administrative assistant. "People are always trying to promote me. . . I love what I am doing."

longtime member of the National Organization for Women (NOW), told women that working was a game and that they must learn how to play it.³ She suggested that female employees who were seeking promotions should draw a pyramid to better understand the company's hierarchy. One of the "unfortunate truths" resulting from this exercise was that "secretarial functions *do not belong anywhere*. These jobs are *outside* the pyramid, nowhere entwined in the network."⁴ According to Harragan, too many women were wasting time trying to satisfy demands of supervisors and were operating as "deluded 'Aunt Toms' who thought authority came from longevity or assumed officiousness."⁵ Used in undergraduate courses and in business schools, *Games Mother Never Taught You* sold more than one million copies.⁶

Another popular managerial manual reinforced the notion that movement towards workplace success required avoidance of clerical work. After Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim – the first two women to have received doctorates from the Harvard Business School (HBS) – taught at HBS, they decided that for women to navigate the male-dominated business world, they needed specialized management instruction. Hennig and Jardim opened the first business school for women only, attempting to combine the rigorous quantitative courses and case method instruction from HBS with a focus on gender differences in organizational management.⁷ They authored *The Managerial Women* (1977), based largely on their research in organizational behavior. The book told women how to not self-sabotage, or fall into certain patterns that were common to women who were striving to reach the managerial or executive levels. The authors warned against secretarial work, which some women chose after earning a liberal arts degree because they needed to find employment. Female college graduates "[were going] to secretarial school to acquire something they [could] tell themselves *is* a skill because there is a demand for it, it is tangible, it can be used."⁸ As secretaries, superiors would praise their accuracy and compliance, but, according to Hennig and Jardim, secretaries were not on promotable tracks, even to "middle management." Annual reviews declared that women in secretarial work were "lacking in management potential" and would remain "terminal in [their] present position," according to their supervisors. Thus, secretaries should not mistake consistent praise for promises of promotions.⁹

These two bestselling advice books took approaches whereby individual women were responsible for their own successes: women should not blame institutional barriers for their own lack of mobility. Despite the fact that feminists had fought against legal and cultural obstacles to allow women access to these jobs, the focus, according to Hennig, should be less on existing structural challenges and more on adapting to the current

³ Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim, *The Managerial Woman* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977).

⁴ Betty Lehan Harragan, *Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Gamesmanship for Women* (New York: Warner Books, 1978), 38.

⁵ Harragan, *Games Mother Never Taught You*, 40.

⁶ Edwin McDowell, "Betty Harragan, 77, Advocate of Women's Workplace Rights," *New York Times*, July 14, 1998.

⁷ Nan Roberston, "For Ambitious Women, A Survival Guide to the Land of Bosses," *New York Times*, June 28, 1977; Rhonda Seegal, "Business School Started by 2 Women Professors," *Nashua Telegraph* (New Hampshire), November 8, 1977.

⁸ Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman*, 58.

⁹ Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman*, 60.

corporate environment. “The difference between us and the women’s movement,’ Dr. Hennig said, ‘is that they say we have to make men change and we say we have to change first.’”¹⁰ Professional women became successful by learning the ways of the male domain. Thus, these books did not confront the economic or cultural devaluation of women’s work by addressing patterns of bias or calling for policy change. Instead they wanted to help individual women adopt the strategies and behaviors that had helped men to succeed in higher-paid, higher-status positions.

Career advisors usually described workplaces as full of endless possibilities depending on one’s individual ambitions and desires. They seemed unaware of economic and educational limitations, as well as variable access to social networks, which could explain why some women remained in low paying or unfulfilling jobs.¹¹ Rather, their comments suggested that women had the power to define the course of their own careers in the spirit of Horatio Alger. The editor of *Working Woman* magazine, the first magazine explicitly for wage-earning women, explained in 1980 that she had been receiving “an unusual number of letters from readers who feel they are stuck in their careers... [but] most of the stuckness is in our heads.”¹² Women were hindering themselves by not learning how to climb corporate ladders that men had been ascending for decades. This motivational, can-do attitude masked structural barriers such as low pay and lack of upward mobility that disparately affected women in clerical jobs more so than women in professional work.

As some women gained insight and confidence from the messages in career self-help literature, they chose to leave female-dominated work and move into business-related fields. Former teacher Judy Boston revealed that her search for a new career began upon reading *What Color Is Your Parachute?* authored by Richard Nelson Bolles.¹³ The book helped her to determine that she wanted a job that offered more “money and power,” but when she sent out resumes, “she discovered that being an ex-teacher was worse than having no experience at all.” According to Boston, to get her new, commission-based job selling advertising space, “You [had] to hide the fact that you’ve taught... as though it were a communicable disease.”¹⁴ In the article “Is There Life After Teaching?” *Working Woman* magazine described a “national problem” of burnout that was afflicting teachers,

¹⁰ Marylin Bender, “Behavioral Differences Stressed in Women’s Management Training,” *New York Times*, February 11, 1974.

¹¹ For a discussion of social capital see Pam Laird, *Pull: Networking and Success Since Benjamin Franklin* (Cambridge: Harvard, 2006), 266-338.

¹² Kate Rand Lloyd, “To Our Readers,” *Working Woman* 5, no. 10, October 1980, 6.

¹³ Richard Nelson Bolles, *What Color Is Your Parachute?* (self published, 1970; Berkeley: Ten Speed Press, 1972). Numerous articles in *Working Woman* suggested this book including Jaqueline Mason, “Career Fixers,” *Working Woman* 2, no. 9, Sept. 1977, 80. Also about workplace videos see Letter from Tamara L. Browne, National Association of Banking Women to Sylvia Kramer, Women’s Action Alliance, June 30, 1983, Box 82, folder 28, Women’s Action Alliance Records, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. To improve women’s management skills for these types of positions, the National Association of Women in Banking, a group of female professionals in the industry, produced a five-part video series in the early 1980s that emphasized the importance of self-reliance. In “Looking at Leadership,” thirty successful women discussed their roles as productive professionals and emphasized that women could become leaders in all realms of their lives.

¹⁴ Karen Levine, “Selling Big,” *Working Woman* 2, no. 12 December 1977, 30.

most of whom were underpaid and overworked. Over 100,000 teachers had left the classroom in 1980 to pursue other jobs. Through career counseling and self-help manuals, many – like Judy Boston – were making the “difficult transition” to work in business and government jobs.¹⁵

Similar to how many were leaving teaching, women were “leaving the secretarial field” to find higher-paying opportunities.¹⁶ During the job search, career advisors recommended that they minimize their secretarial experience if they wanted to transition into management. One career counselor suggested that a secretary in search of a management position should emphasize certain skills on her resume but “underplay the secretarial role.” itself.¹⁷ This advice demonstrated that some HR managers considered clerical work not just irrelevant experience, but also contrary to the desired knowledge, skills, and abilities of an ideal managerial candidate. According to career experts, certain qualities had helped female managers to advance; they were assertive, rational, non-emotional, politically savvy, confident and credible.¹⁸ These qualities were not the qualities typically attributed to women or to clerical workers, signifying that aspiring female professionals would have to move beyond traditional gender roles to assume traits more common in men.

Working Woman magazine, established in 1976 as the first magazine explicitly for wage-earning women, proclaimed that it provided advice solely to upwardly-mobile women, slanting its content to appeal to the female professional. Its editor, Kate Rand Lloyd, wanted to focus on “women who [were] making news and breaking old patterns as they [moved] into and up through the work force.”¹⁹ After serving as managing editor of both *Vogue* and *Glamour* magazines, she became editor of *Working Woman* in 1978 when it was bankrupt, just two years after the publication launched.²⁰ She shifted its focus towards corporate businesswomen and those who aspired to similar, pioneering positions. According to Lloyd, the magazine was for women making anywhere “from \$6000 to \$60,000” as long as readers had “points of view that [aimed] upwards.”²¹ With this strategy of targeting female professionals and aspiring professionals, Lloyd enjoyed great success, quadrupling circulation in two years. *Working Woman* became the fastest growing magazine in 1980. With two million readers that year, a variety of wage-earning women – not just executives – were buying the magazine.²²

¹⁵ Rochelle Distelheim, “Is There Life After Teaching?” *Working Woman* 5, no. 12, December 1980, 52-54, 59. Also see Enid Harlow, “Learn, Grow, Prosper” *Working Woman* 3, no. 9, August 1978, 40-45. In this article, Harlow suggested that teachers leave a dead end field and find work that was better paid. She featured the story of a teacher who becomes a broker at Goldman Sachs.

¹⁶ “The Vanishing Secretary,” in *Network News* from the Institute for Managerial and Professional Women, Vol. 1, no. 9, October 1979, Carton 3, Women’s Newsletter and Periodical Collection, PR-4, 77.1.3, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

¹⁷ Vicki W. Kramer, “HOTLINE,” *Working Woman* 5, no. 11, November 1980, 114.

¹⁸ Betsy Jaffe, Catalyst, Women at Work Exposition, October 1979, Box 92, folder 37, Women’s Action Alliance Records, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

¹⁹ “Women’s Conference to Hear Kate Lloyd,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 17, 1983.

²⁰ Barbara Bradley, “As Women Climb, So Does a Magazine,” *Christian Science Monitor*, February 9, 1987.

²¹ Kate Rand Lloyd, “To Our Readers,” *Working Woman* 3, no. 6, June 1978, 4.

²² Kate Rand Lloyd, “To Our Readers,” *Working Woman* 5, no. 11, November 1980, 8.

As the magazine tailored its articles towards women who had become pioneers in business, science, and law, *Working Woman* distorted the problems facing the majority of the U.S. female labor force. Its articles assumed that all women regardless of class, age, or familial status had opportunities to attend college and graduate school. Working-class women and their concerns were invisible on the pages of *Working Woman*. While most women who worked outside the home did so in sex-segregated clerical or service jobs, *Working Woman* defined a wage-earning woman as a female professional who was moving into a male-dominated career.

Numerous letters to the editor – which were not published in *Working Woman* but preserved in the Smith College archives – challenged the magazine’s narrow definition of a working woman. Some women noted that the magazine’s perspectives left out the needs of women remaining in sex-segregated work. One clerical employee who worked in a small office said that she used to subscribe to *Working Woman* but that the magazine did not help her daughter (a nurse), her daughter-in-law (a teacher) or her with their problems of being overworked, underpaid, and trying to “hold our lives and our families together.”²³ Another letter complained: “the title of your magazine, WORKING WOMAN, indicated to me that it was addressing the issues of working women everywhere,” but in fact, this government worker felt “slighted” and “inadequate” by the articles addressed to corporate women who earned “big money” and traveled extensively. She asked the magazine to “address the issues of thousands of women like me who are in hi [sic] pressure jobs with low pay, and low rewards. We are a very dedicated group of women, and I don’t think we should go unrecognized.”²⁴ A similar clerical complaint stated:

Your magazine has forgot [sic] about the other side of our working women. I mean the secretaries, Accounting Assistants, hotel carriers, telephone operators, Sales clerks, Bus drivers, Word Processors, oh! Do you get the idea. I consider my self [sic] a professional and a career woman in every respect bringing up my children and being able to deal with people on all levels of society. You make me feel that your magazine is geared to college grads, MBA people only.²⁵

This woman demanded recognition for working-class women who were struggling to support their families on meager wages. She thought they deserved the same respect that was granted to “college grads, MBA people.” Another secretary, frustrated by the devaluing of secretarial work, asked, “why is it that all the books and magazine articles on job-hunting automatically assume we all want executive positions?” She had enjoyed being a secretary and thought she was very good at it. She believed that secretaries were “so important to the world of business” that business would be “paralyzed” without

²³ Letter of September 24, 1981 to Kate Rand Lloyd, *Working Woman* Magazine, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

²⁴ Letter of July 8, 1982 to Kate Rand Lloyd, *Working Woman* Magazine, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

²⁵ Letter of August 24, [1981] to Kate Rand Lloyd, *Working Woman* Magazine, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

them.²⁶ While these readers wanted the magazine to address the problems facing sex-segregated workers and underscore the value of support positions, *Working Woman* was emphasizing the concerns of credentialed women who were striving for professional mobility in what used to be a man's world.

Other clerical workers admitted that they were reading *Working Woman* solely because it was one of the only national magazines, along with *Saavy*, that addressed the issues of women in the workforce. But many were finding that the content was not relevant to their problems. One clerical employee told the magazine that it should address more than "corporate gamesmanship" for the professional, upwardly-mobile woman, referencing the magazine's similarity to books such as Betty Harragan's *Games Mother Never Taught You*.²⁷ Another woman from Georgia, who in 1983 was making less than \$10,000 per year in her office job, criticized a salary negotiation article by Harragan. This worker said that unlike the concerns of women with four-year degrees and professional contacts, "the name of the game [for her was] income to keep alive versus no job and bare subsistence on welfare."²⁸ Many secretarial workers wanted chances for promotions but lacked the necessary resources and qualifications to attend college and graduate school.²⁹

Certain women noticed also that the advice in *Working Woman* did not address the challenges they faced based on their class, race, or age. A single mother who had been a clerical worker for 15 years "to put food on the table and pay the rent" was trying for "something better" and was planning on enrolling in school to earn an associate degree. She wanted to see *Working Woman* address financial and educational issues for those without an advanced degree and for the women who had not been working in the "great positions we all wish for."³⁰ A woman of color complained that *Working Woman* "focuses almost exclusively on white women, seemingly ignoring that minority women are a part of its readership."³¹ Another woman told the magazine to "[please] try to print some articles on what the 'poor' class are wearing and how to get that job after one reaches the

²⁶ Letter of n.d. [1982] to *Working Woman* Magazine, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

²⁷ Letter of 1982 to Kate Rand Lloyd, *Working Woman* Magazine, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

²⁸ Letter of 1983 to Kate Rand Lloyd, *Working Woman* Magazine, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

²⁹ In the 1970s, the number of women earning college and graduate degrees was increasing, with younger women attending college, actively planning for their careers when they graduated. Thomas A. Diprete and Claudia Buchmann, *The Rise of Women: The Growing Gender Gap in Education and What It Means for American Schools* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2013). Furthermore, corporations were recruiting externally for managerial and professional positions, hiring well-educated, young women to fulfill affirmative action guidelines. See third section of Chapter Four, Elias dissertation.

³⁰ Letter of February 16, 1983 to Kate Rand Lloyd, *Working Woman* Magazine, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

³¹ Letter of n.d. to *Working Woman* Magazine, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

30-40 age bracket.”³² Echoing similar sentiments, another clerical worker called for the magazine to approach the issues of older women who lacked college educations. This single mother in her 40s had been a secretary for twenty-five years. Working towards an associate degree in management, she was hoping to advance to a more “responsible and rewarding” position. Unsurprisingly, an editor had written a big “NO” in red ink on the top, signaling that the letter would not appear in the magazine. The problems of older women without college degrees apparently did not align with the magazine’s mission of featuring articles for and about professional women who were “movers and shakers,” in the words of Lloyd.³³

Clerical workers were becoming increasingly aware of the devaluation of their jobs, particularly as other women were able to garner esteem and attention by becoming pioneers. A Boston University clerical employee was ashamed to say that she was a secretary when someone asked what she did even though she knew that she should not feel embarrassed about how hard she worked.³⁴ *Working Woman* promoted this devaluation of clerical work, even suggesting that support workers were facing pathological problems. Kate Rand Lloyd mourned that all secretaries were suffering from a “terminal illness” because their jobs depended on pleasing other people. According to Lloyd, secretaries had to prioritize being liked above ambition, preventing them from achieving higher positions in the workforce.³⁵

In 2013, Sheryl Sandberg’s multi-million bestseller *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead* trumpeted a certain recipe for workplace feminism: with sufficient commitment, women could overcome long-standing beliefs about gender and be successful in the corporation. The book was celebrated as a “landmark manifesto” for a new generation of women.³⁶ Sandberg, the chief operating officer for Facebook, used personal anecdotes and social science research to suggest that by adjusting their interpersonal behavior and self-perception, or “leaning in,” women could get ahead.

Lean In is a new iteration of the advice literature of the 1970s and 1980s. The first generation of female pioneers could ascend into higher-status corporate positions by learning “the rules of the game,” in the words of Betty Harragan. This mobility was not about collective activism but about individual success. To be sure, pioneering female

³² Letter of September 22, 1982 to *Working Woman Magazine*, n.d. Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

³³ Letter of February 8, 1983 to Kate Rand Lloyd, *Working Woman Magazine*, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. For “mover and shaker” language see Letter from Kate Rand Lloyd to reader, July 22, 1982, *Working Woman Magazine*, Letters to the Editor, 1981-1983, Unprocessed, location 58A, ACC# 83-60, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

³⁴ Barbara Rahke, interviewed by Stacey Heath, SEIU District 925 Legacy Project, Walter P. Reuther Library, Wayne State University, May 23, 2006.

³⁵ Kate Rand Lloyd, Editor of *Working Woman* magazine, Women at Work Exposition, October 1979, Box 93, folder 7, Women’s Action Alliance Records, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

³⁶ Janet Maslin, “Lessons from the Stratosphere, and How to Get There: Sheryl Sandberg’s ‘Lean In’ Offers Lessons,” *New York Times*, March 6, 2013. Lisa Bonos, “A Year After ‘Lean In,’ These are Sandberg’s Truest Believers,” *Washington Post*, March 7, 2014.

professionals did advance women's range of career choices, all while having to endure economic discrimination and harassment from male colleagues. But on the whole, professional females, who were educated and well-connected women, increasingly had more options as the 1980s became the 1990s. Working-class women in sex-segregated work faced limited opportunities as union efficacy wavered and clerical work remained devalued. The traits that had long been associated with a private secretary – nurturing, obedient, and submissive – were not the same traits that would give the professional woman an edge in a man's world. By the 1990s, contrasting images of working women had emerged: some were viewed as content to be in subservient, service jobs while the more visible and celebrated women were striving for sex equality through professional engagements.

To be blunt, Corporate America is a bubble. An asset that is no longer worth the investment. An investment that no longer has a future. Yes, in the past having a glorious and successful career in Corporate America was arguably the most sought after goal. Making the iconic "six figs," having a corner office, working "down town where all the action is," and living the life of a Mad Man was precisely what your parents, Hollywood, media, schools, the government, and the movies all told you to want. And, truth be told, that IS what you should have wanted. A successful, stable, h